



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,369	11/06/2003	Marc S. Gorans	294.00170101	8480
26813	7590	11/03/2006	EXAMINER	
MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A.			VALENTI, ANDREA M	
P.O. BOX 581415			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458			3643	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/702,369	GORANS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrea M. Valenti	3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 15-17 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 14 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,446,819 to Gourlandt in view of Netherlands Patent NL 8802812A to Meyn.

Regarding Claims 1, 19, 20, 21, and 15, Gourlandt teaches a method of treating the beak of a bird, the method comprising: positioning a bird head in a bird head positioning device (Gourlandt Fig. 7 #30), wherein the bird head positioning device comprises first and second major sides, and a beak receiving aperture formed through the first and second major sides of the bird head positioning device, wherein at least a portion of the lower beak of the bird head protrudes through the beak receiving aperture (Gourlandt Fig. 6 #56) and is exposed proximate the second major side of the bird head positioning device; inherently pressing inward on the throat of the bird **proximate** the base of the lower beak wherein the pressing is directed towards the tongue of the bird using a tongue control protrusion protruding from a surface defining the beak receiving aperture in the bird head positioning device (Gourlandt Col. 4 line 51-59 element #62 extends across #21); debeaking and burning the beak at the second major surface of the bird head positioning device, wherein the beak exposed proximate the second major

side of the bird head positioning device while pressing inward on the throat of the bird (Gourlandt teaches the head is immobilized in the head restraint and thus the head is pressed inward to maintain the immobile position in the head device); teaches that either the top or bottom or both beaks can be treated (Gourlandt Col. 5 line 52-55).

Gourlandt is silent on emitting energy from a non-contact energy source. However, Meyn teaches the same type of treatment utilizing a known alternate energy source (Meyn #5 laser). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Gourlandt with the teachings of Meyn at the time of the invention since the modification is merely an engineering design choice involving the selection of a known alternate equivalent treatment source (i.e. mechanical versus laser) for the advantage of a more precise and cleaner cut and to reduce the likely hood of transmitting disease from one bird to another.

Regarding Claim 2, Gourlandt as modified teaches the pressing is performed while the bird head is positioned in the bird head positioning device (Gourlandt teaches the bird is inserted and suspended in the device thus it is inherently pressed on by first the hand inserting it and then by element #66).

Regarding Claim 3, Gourlandt as modified teaches the pressing is performed after the bird head is positioned in the bird head positioning device (Gourlandt #66).

Regarding Claims 4 and 5, Gourlandt as modified is silent on adjusting a force used to perform the pressing or limiting a force used to perform the pressing. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the

teachings of Gourlandt at the time of the invention to prevent from causing injury to the bird and based on the size of the bird.

Regarding Claims 6 and 11, Gourlandt teaches the bird head positioning device comprises a tongue control protrusion, wherein the tongue control protrusion presses into the throat of the bird proximate the base of the lower beak (Gourlandt Col. 4 line 51-59, element #62 is inserted in the mouth of the bird and is thus inherently functions as a tongue control that press into the throat, once again applicant has merely claimed "proximate" the lower beak and element #62 can extend across #21 to press on the throat under the head).

Regarding Claim 7, Gourlandt as modified is silent on adjusting a force used to perform the pressing or limiting a force used to perform the pressing. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of Gourlandt at the time of the invention to prevent from causing injury to the bird and based on the size of the bird.

Regarding Claims 8 and 15, Gourlandt as modified teaches the tongue control protrusion extends into the beak receiving aperture (Gourlandt Fig. 6 and Col. 4 line 51-59 and Fig. 7 illustrates element #62 inside of the aperture in element #30).

Regarding Claims 9, 13 and 17, Gourlandt as modified is silent on explicitly teaching adjusting a distance by which the tongue control protrusion extends into the beak receiving aperture. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of Gourlandt at the time of the invention since the modification is merely making something adjustable while performing the same intended

function, modified to accommodate different size birds. Making something adjustable does not present a patentably distinct limitation [*In re Stevens*, 212 F.2d 197, 198, 101 USPQ 284, 285 (CCPA 1954)].

Regarding Claims 10, 12 and 16, Gourlandt as modified teaches the tongue control protrusion extends into the beak receiving aperture by a fixed distance (Gourlandt Fig. 6 #62).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22 and 23 are allowed.

Claims 14 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner maintains that applicant has not structurally defined the tongue protrusion and its structural relationship to the bird's throat and the head receiving aperture in a manner that patentably distinguishes over the teachings of the cited prior art of record in claims 1-21. Applicant has not claimed that the protrusion is directly protruding from the surface of the bird head positioning device, applicant has not structurally defined the features of the head positioning device and the relationship to the protrusion i.e. the protrusion directly protrudes from the surface of the second major side of the bird head positioning device that is positioned under the lower beak of the

bird etc. Furthermore, Gourlandt teaches a tongue control protrusion that is either positioned in the bird's mouth or under the lower portion of the bird's head towards the throat (Gourlandt Col. 4 line 51-59). Thus, the concept of a protrusion in relation to a bird head receiving aperture is known and merely shifting the location of a known element that performs the same intended function is an obvious modification for one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant's amendment to claim 1 has overcome the previously presented double patenting rejection, thus the double patenting rejection has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Valenti whose telephone number is 571-272-6895. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am-5:30pm M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 571-272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Andrea M. Valenti
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3643

01 November 2006